UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

SUMMARY ORDER

THIS SUMMARY ORDER WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REPORTER AND MAY NOT BE CITED AS PRECEDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT, BUT MAY BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION OF THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT IN A SUBSEQUENT STAGE OF THIS CASE, IN A RELATED CASE, OR IN ANY CASE FOR PURPOSES OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL OR RES JUDICATA.

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 10th day of August, Two thousand and six.

PRESENT:

1

2

HON DAIDHY WINTED

HON. CHE	TER J. STRAUB, RT A. KATZMANN,	
	Circuit Judges.	-
Wei Kang Chen	Petitioner,	
-V		No. 05-5800-ag NAC
Alberto R. Gonzales,	Respondent.	
FOR PETITIONER:	William P. Joyce, Bost	on, Massachusetts.
FOR RESPONDENT:		rates Attorney; Tamra Phipps; Karin B. United States Attorneys, Tampa, Florida.
UPON DUE CON	SIDERATION of this petit	ion for review of the Board of Immigration
Appeals ("BIA") decision,	it is hereby ORDERED, A	DJUDGED, AND DECREED that the
petition for review is DEN	IED.	

Wei Kang Chen, through counsel, petitions for review of the September 2005 BIA order

affirming Immigration Judge ("IJ") Joanna Miller Bukzspan's decision denying his third motion to reopen deportation proceedings. In November 1996, the IJ had denied Chen's initial motion to reopen after he had been ordered deported *in absentia* in November 1995. We assume the parties' familiarity with the underlying facts and procedural history.

We are without jurisdiction to review the merits of the underlying deportation proceeding as Chen did not file a timely petition for review of that decision. *See Kaur v. BIA*, 413 F.3d 232, 233 (2d Cir. 2005) (per curiam) ("It is well established that the filing of a motion to reopen does not toll the time for filing a petition for review of the BIA's exclusion or deportation orders."). Our review is, therefore, limited to whether the BIA exceeded its allowable discretion by dismissing Chen's appeal of the IJ's denial of his third motion to reopen. *See Twum v. INS*, 411 F.3d 54, 58 (2d Cir. 2005). An abuse of discretion may be found where the BIA's decision "provides no rational explanation, inexplicably departs from established policies, is devoid of any reasoning, or contains only summary or conclusory statements; that is to say, where the Board has acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner." *Ke Zhen Zhao v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 265 F.3d 83, 93 (2d Cir. 2001) (internal citations omitted).

Here, the BIA did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Chen's appeal. Chen's contention that the IJ erroneously denied his third motion to reopen due to numerical limitations fails because that motion was barred under 8 C.F.R. 1003.2(c)(2) ("A party may file only one motion to reopen deportation or exclusion proceedings").

To the extent that the BIA chose not to exercise its discretion to reopen proceedings *sua sponte*, review of that decision is beyond the Court's jurisdiction. *See Ali v. Gonzales*, 448 F.3d 515 (2d Cir. 2006) (holding that we lack jurisdiction to review a decision of the BIA as to

1	whether to reopen an alien's immigration proceedings sua sponte under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a)).	
2	Lastly, because Chen fails to raise his claim for cancellation of removal in his petition, any	
3	challenge to the BIA's resolution of this issue is deemed waived. See Yueqing Zhang v.	
4	Gonzales, 426 F.3d 540, 546 n.7 (2d Cir. 2005) (emphasizing that, "[i]ssues not sufficiently	
5	argued in the briefs are considered waived and normally will not be addressed on appeal").	
6	For the foregoing reasons, the petition for review is DENIED. The pending motion for a	
7	stay of removal in this petition is DENIED as moot.	
8		
9	FOR THE COURT:	
10	Roseann B. MacKechnie, Clerk	
11		
12	By:	